

Appia No. 10/760,196  
Amndt. Dated June 6, 2006  
Response to Office Action of April 19, 2006

2

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated April 19, 2006.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Martinez-Pacheco. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Applicant maintains the arguments presented in the previous response that Martinez-Pacheco fails to teach the explicit claim limitation that the one or more conduits direct air over the printhead.

Martinez-Pacheco teaches an ink cartridge 100 with ink stored in a chamber 101. Within the ink chamber 101 is a bladder 120 that defines an air chamber 121. The air chamber 121 is sealed from the ink chamber 101 by a seal 122. A fitment 112 at the top of the cartridge has a conduit 113 running through it that provides an air vent to the air chamber 121. As the ink volume within chamber 101 is consumed through use of the printhead 103, air is provided through the vent 113 into the volume 121 to maintain an appropriate pressure inside the ink volume. The only purpose of the air inlet is to provide air into the volume 121.

That is, Martinez-Pacheco teaches directing air into the air chamber 121. Martinez-Pacheco fails to teach air being directed over the printhead as explicitly required by claim 1. The construction of the cartridge taught by Martinez-Pacheco does not allow any air to be directed over the printhead, as required by claim 1, because the air inlet 113 is disposed remotely from the printhead 103. Because the ink volume 101 is sealed from the air inlet by seal 122 there is no possible air path from the air inlet to the printhead 103. Air contact on the printhead is further prevented by the standpipe 105, as specifically described in paragraph [0022] with reference back to the printhead 115 and standpipe 116 described in paragraph [0016]. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Martinez-Pacheco cannot possibly teach that air is directed over the printhead as explicitly defined by claim 1 of the present application.

In light of these submissions, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is novel over Martinez-Pacheco and that claim 1 and the dependent claims are allowable. Further consideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,  
Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia  
Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762